IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA CLARKSBURG

Crystal Dawn Roth,

Petitioner,

v.

Civ. Action No. 1:23-CV-56 Crim. Action No. 1:21-CR-46-2 (Kleeh)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 138] AND DISMISSING § 2255 PETITION [ECF NO. 111]

On July 7, 2023, Crystal Dawn Roth ("Petitioner") through counsel, filed her *Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside*, or Correct Sentence by a Person in Federal Custody (the "Motion"). [ECF No. 111]. 12 The Motion raises a challenge of ineffective assistance of counsel during sentencing. Id.

I. REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and the local rules, the Court referred the action to United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Aloi for initial review. On May 6, 2024, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") [ECF No. 138], recommending the Court deny the Motion and dismiss the case with prejudice. Id.

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all docket numbers refer to Criminal Action No. 1:21CR46-2.

The R&R also informed the parties regarding their right to file specific written objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. Under Rule 12 of the Local Rules of Prisoner Litigation Procedure of the Northern District of West Virginia, "[a]ny party may object to a magistrate judge's recommended disposition by filing and serving written objections within fourteen (14) calendar days after being served with a copy of the magistrate judge's recommended disposition." LR PL P Therefore, parties had fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of service of the R&R to file "specific written objections, identifying the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection is made, and the basis of such objection." The R&R further warned them that the "[f]ailure to file written objections . . . shall constitute a waiver of de novo review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals."

Objections to the R&R were originally due May 20, 2024. Petitioner, by counsel, moved for an extension to file objections to the R&R [ECF No. 139], which the Court granted on May 21, 2024. ECF No. 140. Accordingly, objections were due on June 20, 2024. Id. However, to date, Petitioner has not filed any objections.

When reviewing a magistrate judge's R&R, the Court must review de novo only the portions to which an objection has been timely made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Otherwise, "the Court may adopt,

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 138]

without explanation, any of the magistrate judge's

recommendations" to which there are no objections. Dellarcirprete

v. Gutierrez, 479 F. Supp. 2d 600, 603-04 (N.D.W. Va. 2007) (citing

Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)). Courts will

uphold portions of a recommendation to which no objection has been

made unless they are clearly erroneous. See Diamond v. Colonial

Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

II. DECISION

Accordingly, after receiving no objections, the Court

reviewed the R&R for clear error. Upon careful review, and finding

no clear error, the Court ADOPTS the R&R [ECF No. 138]. The Motion

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence

by a Person in Federal Custody is **DENIED and DISMISSED WITH**

PREJUDICE [ECF No. 111].

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to

counsel of record via electronic means.

DATED: July 10, 2024

THOMAS S. KLEEH, CHIEF JUDGE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

3